



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/601,562	06/24/2003	Young-Gu Kim	1293.1729	7742
21171 7590 07/30/2007 STAAS & HALSEY LLP SUITE 700 1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005			EXAMINER VU, TUAN A	
			ART UNIT 2193	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 07/30/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/601,562	KIM, YOUNG-GU	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Tuan A. Vu	2193	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Tuan A. Vu. (3) \_\_\_\_\_

(2) David Cutitta. (4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview: 25 July 2007.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) discussed: 1,9.

Identification of prior art discussed: Sybex, Intel/WBTA.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.



Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The Applicant's representative requested that the prosecution should be focused on a key feature which Applicant believe his invention; that is the storing of a installation executable concurrent to the initial installation the target driver, a key feature which it is believed no prior art reference has anticipated. That is, the representative demonstrated that neither IntelWBTA or Sybex anticipates this providing of an executable so to expediently support future re-installation of the driver by having the installation file resident in the user machine; and wanted the Examiner to explain the rationale as to how the references as combined would render the above feature obvious when it is clearly missing from the references a explicit teaching of such executable being resident for reinstallation. The Examiner attempted to show that obviousness can be effectuated not just by a form of anticipation but by a combination of information coming from suggested teachings and level of skill in the art at the time the claim language is interpreted for novelty merits; and accordingly has mentioned that if the feature is the core of invention, the examiner would adopt a different mindset when addressing future submission by the Applicant because according to the discussion, the above recited feature would not be needlessly expanded further, even when the observations made by the Examiner have been made known. One of these observations were to mention that the claims need to impart some insight about context in which steps actions do happen, and so with a definite timeframe or sequence that would provide a further constraint to one wishing to find a art rejection. Finally, the representative mentioned that if the references are maintained it would hard for the prosecution to show to the Appeal board that even as combined the references anticipate the Applicant's main feature..